



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

curious phrase "the extreme psychological view"—are regarding the child merely as an individual and encouraging him in "an absolute disregard of the feelings and wishes of others." But children show protective and unselfish impulses towards their younger brothers and sisters and towards animals just as they show impulses towards fear and curiosity, and these and other instinctive tendencies must be regarded as the germs of what Professor Welton calls the "higher spiritual life," which is consequently better described as a development of instinct than as "beyond" instinct.

The two remaining chapters, on the "Means" and the "Agents" of education, contain much suggestive exposition of current educational topics. Perhaps the most valuable sections are those on the connection between a boy's home interests and outlook, and the kind of subject which he is likely to appreciate in school. This point and the corresponding claim of the parent to a voice in what his child learns, deserve more attention than they have hitherto received, and Professor Welton's remarks should help to correct some too prevalent opinions such as that the half-time system persists entirely owing to parental short-sightedness and selfishness. There is an interesting discussion, too, on the different types of schools which are desirable and on their respective functions, and on the need for more and better-planned diversity. Finally we welcome the just appreciation of the position of those to whom definite teaching of dogmatic religion seems an essential part of all education: anyone who has discussed this subject with average "undenominationalists" will sympathise with Professor Welton's comment on their frequent inability to understand it.

CHRISTABEL MEREDITH.

Bangor, Ireland.

KANT'S CRITIQUE OF JUDGEMENT. Translated with Introduction and Notes by J. H. Bernard, D.D., B.C.L., Bishop of Ossory. Second edition, revised. London: Macmillan & Co. 1914. Pp. xlviii, 429.

Dr. Bernard, now Bishop of Ossory, is to be congratulated on the appearance of a second edition of his translation of Kant's *Critique of Judgement*. His translation, published over twenty-one years ago, was the pioneer English translation of the last of Kant's three *Critiques*, and it still remains the only one that

covers the entire work. The German text has been carefully revised by Professor Windleband, whose fine edition forms the fifth volume of Kant's Collected Works as issued by the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences (Berlin, 1908), and this revision has necessitated a number of changes in the new English version. These changes, some corrections suggested by works that have since appeared, and the substitution of the word *Critique* or *criticism* for *Kritik* throughout, seem to account for the only alterations that have been made. It would, of course, be too much to expect the Bishop, who has now many demands on his time, to undertake a complete revision; but there were some serious mistakes that one would have thought might have been brought to his notice. Thus at page 15 we read: "This is the *Judgement*, of which we have cause for supposing according to analogy that it may contain in itself, if not a special legislation, yet a special principle to be sought according to laws, though merely subjective *à priori*." The rendering: "a special principle of its own to be sought according to laws," seems to follow rather closely that of M. Barni, whose work Dr. Bernard says he had before him while performing his task, but did not find of much service (xlv). M. Barni's version reads: "un principe qui lui est propre et qu'on doit chercher suivant des lois." As M. Victor Basch points out in his *L'Esthétique de Kant*, page 13, n., this translation "contient un gros contre-sens," and he gives the correct translation "un principe particulier pour chercher des lois." The principle is *heuristic only*, and merely subjective. This is the fundamental point of the whole *Critique*. Casual slips, such as the omission of words, are also mistakes which one would expect to see corrected in a second edition. Thus, to take a case at random, at page 368 "*à priori*" should be inserted after the word supply in the following passage: "But in the absence of a final purpose which pure reason alone can supply," etc. Strange to say, M. Barni makes the same slip. In the following sentence, which occurs at the foot of page 413, we have both a mistake and a slip: "a principle this of which mere speculative philosophy (which could give a merely negative concept of freedom) must despair." The sentence should run "of such knowledge mere" etc.; and the word "even" is omitted before "of freedom." Both mistake and slip occur in M. Barni's translation. A number of other such instances might be cited tending to show that if the French translation was not of much service to

Dr. Bernard it was often positively misleading. M. Barni's excellent translations of the three *Critiques* are still the standard French translations, and it is not improbable that Dr. Bernard was more indebted than he imagined. Conscious of the time and labour which he must have expended on his own translation, he naturally underestimated the assistance which he derived from the French version. But it is to be hoped that those who come after Dr. Bernard will be more generous to him than he was to M. Barni.

Dr. Bernard has republished his original Introduction without alteration of any kind; and, after such a lapse of time, it would have been an almost impossible task for the Bishop to have resumed his studies and brought it completely up to date. But, as he was making corrections from Windleband's edition he might have read the short Introduction which would have made him correct the statement at page xviii that Kant "borrowed little from the writings of his predecessors." As Windleband says, and as Otto Schlapp had previously proved, Kant had an extraordinarily extensive knowledge of the French and English writings on the subject. He spoke to his pupils of English works which are now almost forgotten, *e.g.*, Gerard's *Essay on Genius* (German translation, 1776), which he said was the best work on the subject that had appeared. The influence of his extensive reading appears everywhere. As a whole, however, the Introduction will be found of considerable use to the average student who desires a succinct survey of the *Critique*.

J. C. MEREDITH.

Dublin.

SHORTER NOTICES.

RAILWAY CONDUCTORS, A STUDY IN ORGANIZED LABOR. By Edwin Clyde Robbins. New York: Columbia University, Longmans, Green & Co., Agents, 1914. Pp. xii, 183.

The monograph is divided into three parts: history and government, trade regulations and means of enforcement, and beneficiary features. A sidelight is thrown upon the need of the strike by trade unions. Prior to 1890 the Order of Railway Conductors was opposed to strikes. It was felt "that the Order was not a labor organization; that the strike, as a practical measure, was a failure; and that it was contrary to the principle of individual liberty." But the organization could not continue to maintain this policy, and, when it discarded it, the Order made rapid growth. The public is perhaps interested in the arguments advanced by the Rail-